

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is in response to the office action dated March 30, 2005. In the office action, claims 1-9 and 16-26 were rejected. A detailed discussion of each item in the office action follows.

### **RESPONSE TO THE PRIOR AMENDMENT ARGUMENTS**

In item 2 of the office action, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1-9 over Nygren under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). The claims were amended in response to this item of the office action, and in response to Applicant's conversation with the Examiner today, to add additional structural elements to limit the claims. A more detailed discussion of the amendment to the claims is provided below in regard to items 6-7 of the office action.

### **THE 112 REJECTION**

In items 3-5 of the office action, claims 23-26 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, Applicant's Attorney has amended the phrase "specific components" in claims 23-26 to read --individual component parts--. Applicant's Attorney believes that, based on the amendment to claims 23-26, this basis of rejection has been overcome.

### **THE 102 REJECTION**

In items 6-7 of the office action, claims 1-9 and 16-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Nygren. In response to the Examiner's comments in the office action, and also in response to Applicant's Attorney's conversation with the Examiner earlier today, the claims have been amended to include additional structural limitations to further limit the claims.

Serial number: 10/023,570

Page 12 of 14

In particular, structural limitations have been added independent claims 1 and 4 which further limits of claims by hitting the extension tubes that have multiple nozzles. This limitation does not appear in Nygren. In addition, new dependent claims 27 and 28, which depend from claims 1 and 4 respectively, have been added. These claims further limit the independent claims by adding the support brackets which provide nozzles and also provides work for all platforms and/or holding devices. Neither of these features appear in Nygren.

Support for the amendment to the claims can be found in figure 3 which illustrates the use of multiple nozzles attached to a single extension tube. This is also discussed in the specification at page 11, lines 13-15, which reads:

*... cleaning fluid extension tubes 11 are shown attached to machine sprayers 9 at their proximal end. The extension tubes 11 have nozzles 12 which are aligned with holding devices 10.*

The use of multi-nozzle extension tubes is also discussed on pages 1, line 8 through page 12, line 16, as well as elsewhere throughout the specification.

In regard to figures 10-11, which illustrates the rigid brackets which have an internal conduit that supplies cleaning fluid to attach nozzles, and which also supports the holding platforms or holding devices, this is described in the specification on page 15, lines 5-10, which reads:

*In this figure, a first bracket 14 is attached to a fluid extension 11 which supplies multiple cleaning nozzles 12 with cleaning solvent. The first bracket 14 is also attached to a first holding platform 15 which is configured to hold specific components of the paint sprayer along with other holding devices 10. A holding device 10 is shown mounted on the first holding platform 15 along with other components of the paint sprayer.*

Serial number: 10/023,570

Page 13 of 14

The use of the brackets is also discussed elsewhere in the specification.

Applicant's Attorney believes that based on the amendment to the claims, this basis of rejection has been overcome, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the application with a view toward allowance.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant's Attorney thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's help in prosecuting this invention. In response to the office action, Applicant's Attorney has amended claims 1, 4, 16, 21 and 23-26; canceled claims 3, 9 and 18, and added new claims 27-29. Applicant's Attorney has been careful to avoid the introduction of new matter. In addition, a separate petition and fee for a three month extension of time is attached. Applicant's Attorney believes that all items in the office action dated March 30, 2005 have been addressed, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the claims, as amended, with a view towards allowance. Applicant's Attorney further invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's Attorney for a telephonic interview at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that prosecution of the application can be furthered by so doing.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John C. Smith, Reg. No. 33,284

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent & Trademark Office.

on: September 30, 2005  
Date of Deposit

  
John C. Smith, Reg. No. 33,284

September 30, 2005  
Signature Date

Serial number: 10/023,570

Page 14 of 14